

THE SUPPRESSED BOOK OF INFANTA EULALIA

What the Aunt of the King of Spain Really Wrote in the Little Volume That Brought Her Into Royal Disfavor. Vigorous Views on Divorce, and Other Problems.

"The Thread of Life," by the Countess of Avila, published by the Societe Francaise d'Imprimerie and de Librairie de Paris. Such is the title page of the most discussed book of the decade, for the Countess of Avila is none other than the Infanta Eulalia of Spain, and the "Thread of Life" is the little volume of essays which our visitor of 1893 has involved in so violent a discussion with her nephew, the king.

Report made it quite probable that the publication of the book would cost Eulalia her allowance, and possibly even her titles, although these can be revoked only by a decree of the Cortes. On reading the essays one is indeed moved to hope that the royal lady has an income that does not depend on the approval of the Spanish court, for "The Thread of Life" is as fiery a declaration of independence as ever woman nailed to the wall.

Eulalia is in revolt against very nearly every convention that royalty is brought up to respect, and she has a whole-hearted, unequivocal fashion of speaking her mind. She believes in education for everybody, in all sorts of rights for the workingman, in the complete freedom for women in every walk of life, and in divorce for the asking. Could a Spanish princess wave the red flag of revolution more vigorously?

It is the essay on divorce which has called out the severest protests. We are told, from King Alfonso. It is, however, reasonable to believe that in her remarks about the family and women she has also thrown a few bombs into the court in which she was reared. For her book is not a compilation of commonplaces.

On the subject of the indissolubility of marriage there is no doubt that the Infanta feels strongly. Her own marriage was unhappy, and she speaks from the heart when she declares herself in favor of divorce. She argues the matter at some length.

In her preface the Infanta says that she has been placed near enough to the social questions she discusses to know them and far enough from some to view them without prejudice. She believed that opinions as honest and as carefully thought out as hers would interest those who seek to glean from all elements of society indications of the tendency of the present. And she adds, with a decided pen, that she has never been afraid of criticism.

She talks of the sources of happiness, of friendship, of a score or more of topics, some mildly speculative and some distinctly burning, as when she turns her attention to marriage.

"Marriage," says she, "considered in our society as a necessary mode of union, is a convention regulated by the laws. In the eyes of Roman Catholics marriage being a sacrament, and indissoluble, divorce could not exist.

"According to this principle we would have to resign ourselves to accepting as a sacrament an earthly bond which has more to do with the material than with the spiritual, but it seems singular that the Roman church should teach men, through the voice of its ministers, that human perfection is found in the acceptance of all the sacraments, and then carefully forbid its representatives marriage, which of all sacraments would be useful to them. In doing this the church makes an illogical exception to its rule."

With this beginning the royal rebel prepares to free her mind of many thoughts that must have been accumulating for years. She quotes with approbation and at some length from Dr. Toulouse on the nature of marriage. Freedom of choice in marriage is to him the supreme point of evolution, society has reached its noblest when men and women choose freely in the mates they love. This does not mean promiscuity, for that neither men nor women of high development desire; it is merely freedom to choose happiness, and this point has, of course, been approximated in many countries. "But," adds Dr. Toulouse, "there is a corollary to this namely,

that divorce can also be brought about simply by the will of those united."

"This declaration has the Infanta's warm approval. Let us study divorce from the point of view of its usefulness," she says, and continues:

"Divorce has the advantage of not being considered, like marriage, an eternal chain, a crushing yoke, or a prison deliberately entered into to assure one's subsistence.

"It is just, indeed, not to keep tied to each other people who cannot live together, to put an end to a moral suffering that is often excessive, to do away with constant dangers which sometimes go as far as murder, to escape—in a word, from the sentimental and emotional consequences of the indissolubility of marriage.

"How many beings live together for long years strangers in mind and body! How many are the slaves of marriage whose relations are hideous with mutual hate! Why in the name of a religious principle should one make eternal the hell whose torments are as varied as they are overwhelming? Why should not reason and the right of the individual correct the mistakes of chance, false calculations, and hopes deceived?

"Why should a woman who does not find in her husband the necessary moral support suffer the tortures of a long agony in which she is defenseless, of a perpetual struggle in which she is miserably conquered; and, on the other hand, why should the husband who does not find in his wife the hoped-for companion or the desired slave, find the road to happiness forever closed to him?"

Marriage is based, she argues, on a contract. A contract is certainly something that may be dissolved with readiness whenever it has become clear that it no longer operates for the benefit of the persons interested. There must always be mutual consent in such arrangement. But this view of marriage used not to be taken at all, and the consequences were often disastrous.

"Before divorce was established, men and women who lived together in misunderstanding suffered an agony worse than that of the condemned to death, for nothing can be compared, I repeat, to the torture of being tied, body and soul, in hatred or scorn, or even indifference.

"In times past the strong, the independent, those who did not fear public opinion or who held social conventions cheap, went and lived in separate houses, just as it happens still in certain countries—in Spain, for instance, where divorce does not exist and where legal separation is not even recognized. But although they lived separate, the marriage contract existed none the less, and the question of money became a grave problem to solve. Did husband or wife make debts, they were by the law mutually responsible, and it would happen that one of the couple who had not made the debts would be obliged to pay them. What endless complications, how many doors for dissension, how much piled-up bitterness.

"But there is something even more serious. In a household where there is no real union at all, where there is daily strife, children look on at scenes which shatter their illusions about 'married love.' They are thus the victims of the lack of divorce."

But, contends the essayist, this is not all the evil. When men and women separate, or when they no longer live happily together, inevitably the temptation is to turn to others for consolation. In the case of the man there is often little attempt to conceal such relations, and by the boldness with which he may flaunt his vices the wife and the institution of marriage are alike insulted.

With the woman the case is usually a little different, for she is apt to be more circumspect than the man, but circumstances cannot do everything, and almost invariably there is scandal and trouble and the stirring up of mud. And always marriage, which should stand for all that is



INFANTA EULALIA

beautiful, is besmirched. "Divorce," comments the Infanta, "would put an end to this insult to marriage. Its advantages far surpass the disadvantages alleged by the defenders of an institution that is tottering today because it has remained unchanged in the midst of the social evolution."

The enemies of divorce pretend that it will destroy the family. That cannot be, remarks the Princess calmly, for "there are no longer any families to destroy."

She argues that the old idea of the family long since gave way before the new social order. A child is free of his parent's will at the age of twenty-one or thereabouts. Soon boys and girls go to colleges and rarely see their parents. It is rare to find a parent exercising the authority that once he claimed, and it is rare to find a child accepting it. The gospel of the individual and his right to develop is uppermost today. Moreover, there is not the necessity which once existed for parents to sacrifice themselves for their children—the social organization has been changed. So the argument about destroying the family, concludes Princess Eulalia, is based on hypocrisy, and there is nothing in it.

"Yes, divorce is useful, necessary, moral; but it could and should become even more so. Divorce by mutual consent must become the remedy for the evils that dishonor the human soul. Those who have been unfortunate in marriage must be able to dissolve their union without having to expose to public curiosity, to the malice of lawyers, to the opinions of judges, the intimate details of two existences poisoned by misunderstanding, incompatibility of temper, excesses, or serious wounds."

But beings "freed from their matrimonial jail and ripened experience," must be permitted to marry again. "Nine times out of ten these marriages are happy because the husband and wife had had time to understand each other, because they have obeyed the law of love, because they have escaped from conventionalities, and in general have not been guided by self-interest, that pernicious and preponderating element in the conflict between the sexes.

"Divorce as it is today does not sufficiently solve the distressing problems which arise from marriage. It is inadmissible, inhuman, immoral even that one who has suffered patiently for twenty years 'for the honor of the children' should be condemned, because he or she has deserted hell, to pass the rest of his days in an illicit union without the right of building up a new home and consecrating by marriage the affection and devotion which have cured the ancient hurts, restored the joy of living and created a sense of new moral and social obligations.

The Infanta looks forward to a day when divorce shall be a "law of justice," and not as often, as it is today, a tacit agreement covering licentiousness. Divorce that shall exist by the wish of the one who shall give suffi-

cient reason and is what she hopes soon to see, with perfect freedom for both parties to profit by their experience and marry again.

"That day," she concludes, "will have brought a true and just solution to a confused situation, and a noble work will have been done for the individual and for society."

In this essay the Infanta says flatly that the old idea of the family is an anachronism. She backs up her statement in detail in another essay, entitled "The Family." As a matter of fact, she says, the situation of the modern family has become, particularly in the north, almost artificial, and it is probable that in the near future the institution as it at present exists will go to pieces altogether.

"In France," she says, "and especially among the middle classes, the family seems likely to continue for a long time much as it was in the days of our ancestors, because it forms a sort of association in which all the members are closely allied to defend their common commercial or industrial interests. This sort of family will exist as long as its members, by reason of their association, keep in their old social conventions, and each contributes to the success of the common enterprise. In Spain, where the Arab domination has left traces of its organization, the family still exists in a state of slavery, a condition on which the women pride themselves."

However, these cases are not typical of the rest of the world, for the family differs according to environment, customs, and classes. Then the Princess analyzes the growth of the idea.

"Peace is troubled in domestic life. When there is not a strained situation between the father and the mother there is a lack of understanding between the parents and the children, between the brothers and the sisters, brought about by the conflict of opinions, by mutual intolerance, by the clash of personal interests. Harmony rarely reigns in homes.

"And then it must be said that the reason for marriage is no longer what it was when the union could not be dissolved, when it was founded on the instinct for the protection of property, on the control of a group. The marriage of love, which is the only decent marriage, has destroyed this original meaning of the association, and not being able to assure the durability of its own organization it has created a state of affairs which it calls equality of responsibility before the law, which will not have the man a brutal master and the woman lowered and degraded while she is more virtuous, more moral, and more sober than the man.

"It has been said that it is enough for a woman to be beautiful and to be a mother. That is an ancient absurdity. Woman has a right to be in complete development of all her faculties; she has a right to show all her individuality.

"But, it is said, are not such opinions contrary to the idea of the family? No, indeed. The family, modified in its structure, submitted to the opinions of each member, guaranteeing mutual rights and duties, will be only more beautiful when it has for its adornment children born of a true love, not children of an unequal con-

ting; it is prejudice that keeps one race and one nation from seeing the virtues of the others; it is also prejudice, she concludes, which makes people believe that a person born in a high social position is incapable of thinking.

Which last is certainly a well-placed shot.

"As a modern writer has pointed out, held apart from magnificent realities, so beautiful in their ugliness, kept perpetually in a state of moral dependence worse than physical slavery, leaving the control of the mother only to come under the guardianship of the husband, brought up merely with a view to marriage, transformed suddenly from child to wife and mother, nurtured in prejudices which oppose the development of individuality, sacrificed in advance—women develop normally only when they find a being like the ideal they have elaborately put together in their obscure consciences. And as convention does not permit them to seek this ideal, which for that matter is vague enough and made up from novels, as fate enlightens them usually too late for them to destroy economy of an existence accepted through timidity or ignorance or despair, hewed, moreover, under the control of society, they remain for the most part children resigned to their lot or creatures in revolt seeking chimeras—'misunderstandings,' in fact of all sorts.

"Throughout the centuries men have been denying the finest qualities of women, which are boldness and presence of mind, and most women have come to the point of convincing themselves that these qualities are not feminine and are not even faults."

The Princess is of the opinion that it is owing to the fact that women once exercised the right to choose their mates as they wished that men evolved to their present development.

"In remote times," she says, "in many primitive races the males were chosen by the females, according to their skill, their physical strength, and their natural beauty. This selection brought about a fine evolution of the male among most races, and the result was the production of the ideal type of woman had imagined to herself—of course vaguely and almost unconsciously.

"But when women became the property of men, the slave destined to work for the male, the development of the race ceased from the day the healthful influence of the women's choice was no longer free.

"In a new society which, while maintaining a moral education shall yet give women complete liberty, the attraction of affinities will be victorious and the power of a woman's ideal will prepare the coming of new and vigorous races."

The essayist is most emphatic on questions concerning women, for these have come closest to her and have received her most earnest thought, but she has not confined herself merely to consideration of matters of the relation of the sex. For instance, she has a warm plea for the equal education of all classes.

She thinks that the equalization of the classes is well under way, for not only have those beneath "built ladders to enter the domain that used to seem the exclusive right of the upper classes, but these, too, have not hesitated to leave the heights where prejudices of rank retained them and have invaded the field of trade and commerce."

As to the development of housekeeping Infanta Eulalia has ideas quite in line with the most advanced thought. Many people live, she says, in slavery to their servants and accept their exactions under penalty of social ostracism if they do not have attendants about them. She gives an entertaining account of an Englishwoman who went to bed with her clothes on because the maid would not come and unhook after a stated hour, and of somewhat similar adventures in Germany, America and France.

The observation of the Infanta on this state of affairs is not the commonplace railing at the evil days that have befallen housekeepers. She thinks that the old order has definitely passed and suggests co-operation as a remedy for our ills. She would have service performed by the hour, and done by specialists who do not sleep in the house, who have, in short, all the liberty they want and attend to their employer's affairs when and where it may be arranged.

A last mention should be made of a little essay on prejudice. Prejudices are things for which the Infanta Eulalia can see no reason whatever. It is prejudice that keeps women from ris-

ing; it is prejudice that keeps one race and one nation from seeing the virtues of the others; it is also prejudice, she concludes, which makes people believe that a person born in a high social position is incapable of thinking.

Which last is certainly a well-placed shot.

COST OF COWBOY OUTFIT.
When the city man gets his bills for his new fall suit, his fussy top-coat with the latest style stock collar, his velvet hat, spats and gloves, he is apt to think with some complacency that he had done all that money can do to clothe the outer man. His tailor is the most expensive he can find, his fabrics are all imported, and he contemplates his fancy waistcoat with all the awe that comes with a realization that the buttons alone cost \$1 each.

The same man would be considerably surprised if any one told him that there was an establishment in the West Bottoms that deals exclusively with stockmen and cowboys where a hat costs anywhere from \$12 to \$20 and a pair of trousers from \$15 up to almost any figure. A cowboy with a roll and a proper sense of the fitness of things can safely match tailors' bills with the most fastidious city dresser.

Several skilled workmen will spend weeks making a saddle, hand carving it with artistic designs and mounting it with as much silver and other precious metals as the purchaser desires to pay for. And when a stockman or cowboy wants a saddle he wants it right. It not infrequently happens that his saddle costs more than the horse under it. Regular stock saddles, not made to order, cost as high as \$75, and if the purchaser wants to go in for something fancy they take the lid clear off.

Take spurs, for instance. A good, every-day, knockabout pair of spurs can be had for \$15, but of course it is not contended that they are anything more than a rough and ready article for heavy roadwork. A silver spur, such as would set off a stamped patent leather boot, with a monogram on will come higher, of course. In making an estimate on a complete outfit it would be well to play safe and put spurs down at \$40.

"Chaps" is something every cowboy has to have. "Chaps" is the trade name for those wide affairs that go on like a pair of overalls which are seen in all faithful portrayals of life in the wild, horsey West. Sometimes they are of leather with a long fringe, or if the rider wants to look particularly devilish they are of goat skin with the hair unbarbered. "Chaps" cost anywhere from \$15 to \$25.

But the two articles that the cowboy who wants to shine really turns himself loose on are hats and saddles. A hat can be made a wondrous thing when price is not a discouraging consideration. Of hand-stamped leather with silver filigree and buckle it can be made to weigh several pounds and cost several dollars a pound. It seems that no cowboy would consider himself dressed up without at least five pounds of hat. As to what a cowboy thinks of a saddle can be figured this way: When he starts in to buy an outfit he buys the saddle first and gets just what he wants, and then if he has any money left he buys the other things he needs.

There are fifty pounds of leather in a real cowboy saddle, fifty pounds of leather wonderfully carved, stamped and befringed. It is as big as a hammock with a pommel like the ornamental sternpost of a ship and a back like a rocking chair. There are more rings, straps, thongs and holsters depending from it than a layman could count without trying to learn their various uses. This saddle is a five-room flat full of furniture to the cowboy; he eats, works, loaf and sleeps in it.—Kansas City Star.

SERIOUS SIDE OF A COLD.
Do you know that of all the minor ailments colds are by far the most dangerous? It is not the cold itself that you need to fear, but the serious diseases that it often leads to. Most of these are known as germ diseases. Pneumonia and consumption are among them. Why not take Chamberlain's Cough Remedy and cure your cold while you can? For sale by all dealers. Benson-Smith & Co. agents for Hawaii.



KING ALFONSO OF SPAIN.

"The family, as soon as it appears in history, was a patriarchal association of father, mother, and children. Marriage did not of necessity exist then. There were repeated unions. Promiscuity was such that the women belonged to all the men and the children had no father in particular.

This state of affairs lasted so long that in many cases the Christian Church had, at its beginning, to tolerate communism.

"In the case of polygamy, the woman was kept in seclusion, and was often reduced to the condition of a slave. Her business was to bring into the world children for whom she cared rather through instinct than because of love. The man, for his part, sought only physical satisfaction and cared nothing about paternity.

"Then later, with the aid of civilization, monogamy limited the family and formed groups of classes, but little by little these groups became confused, and did not cling together as formerly, and the condition of the family became profoundly modified.

"Causes of dissolution accumulated slowly in the various social class. Here, the right of primogeniture reserved privileges for some, there the power of the father lessened the authority of the mother over her daughters; everywhere there was a tendency toward emancipation. Finally, in our day the condition of the family is almost everywhere artificial.

"The truth is that man, to preserve

tract and a brutal association based on the interests of the strongest."

The Infanta is prepared to demand the fullest rights for women. She doesn't shrink about it, but she is calmly determined in her remarks, and she does not mince her words. In the chapter on "The Complete Independence of Women" she says:

"To the question, clearly put, 'Why does man give himself the right to live as he chooses, and why should women be obliged to submit to a prohibitive moral code?' men reply that in a legitimate union the paternity of the children should above all else be safeguarded.

"This objection answers only when we are talking of married women. When it comes to 'free' women why forbid them to make use of complete liberty, like men?"

"We are, fortunately, far from the theories of a Schopenhauer, declaring that woman is afflicted with intellectual myopia, that she is childish, futile, narrow; that she is inferior to man in all that concerns justice, uprightness, and scrupulous honesty; that she lacks good sense and the power of reflection; that she is incapable of taking a disinterested part in anything—and so forth.

"Woman's apparent inferiority comes from the fact that she has been oppressed by laws and ill-treated by moralists, and hence arises her native fear and her defiance.